

Will the broadcast flag interfere with consumers ability to make copies of DTV content for their personal use, either on personal video recorders or removable media?

The silly "flag" will be hacked in a week and be meaningless, and millions will buy devices to get around it whether or not it is legal. Aside from that, thousands will use lower tech means to copy things. It is pointless to punish consumers who have hard enough time just working the VCR, just for a minority group who disregards the rules.

The BIG problem has always been organized crime anyway and none of this stuff EVER stops them.

Would the digital flag interfere with consumers ability to send DTV content across networks, such as home digital networks connecting digital set top boxes, digital recorders, digital servers and digital display devices?

Digital "Flags" WILL interfere with consumers. That is the whole point of this, to control how the consumer uses the products THEY OWN.

IT WILL LIMIT THEM because some new technology will come along and consumers will not be able to use it unless the content owners allows them. For example, PDA-like devices that will not have the power to show DTV, but will be able to run dozens of competing formats of video. Transcoding will not be allowed:

Disney does not like my iPod; which is where I put all my music. If it was up to THEM, I would not be able to transcode my CDs into mp3 so that they work on my iPod.

I have the right to own firearms, use a xerox machine, and take a photograph. The choices involving such devices are my UNALIENABLE RIGHT. The consequences are another subject matter altogether.

Would the broadcast flag requirement limit consumers ability to use their existing electronic equipment (equipment not built to look for the flag) or make it difficult to use older components with new equipment that is compliant with the broadcast flag standard?

This is so obvious. There are 2 approaches to this issue:

A) make the system insecure so older devices work. Then later on, flip the switch when there is only a minority left to fight it.

B) Limit interaction with non-approved devices. For example, you can put data in, but not get it back out.

Some combination of the two would be used; or the whole thing is pointless.

Would a broadcast flag requirement limit the development of future equipment providing consumers with new options?

The "flag" or encryption scheme will limit devices to having to sport extra hardware (and who knows what other legal conditions, patents, etc) just to support the DTV. This will increase costs to the consumer.

In REALITY, it will limit development through legal channels, because every little thing that is not politically correct to some media exec will result in legal action.

Not to mention the corporate terrorism being waged on small businesses every day in the form of the threats of costly legal battles.

Most innovation is done by medium-small businesses. (being bought or becoming larger is AFTER they have something working.

And I'll not get into format issues, nobody owns the analog TV format---but this one could limit growth and increase costs...remember BETA?

What will be the cost impact, if any, that a broadcast flag requirement

would have on consumer electronics equipment?

Faster hardware. it will require encryption. Its simple. I'm a programmer, I know what kinds of throughput we are talking about here. It will take some major hardware to decrypt the data. It WILL be cheaper with no such hardware. Also, it will produce more heat and take more power. I'm sure they will want to UPDATE it in a 5 years because someone hacked it on their watch-sized supercomputer so they can watch DTV on it. Then the FCC and consumers have to go through another transition...

--

I find my current tv just fine and do not want to buy a new one. A certain number of people like me will not make the switch, I have what I need on the internet NOW. I'd rather get a computer upgrade than a DTV. I am surprised you can't figure out how to multiplex it yet.

Other Comments:

I can't fax, backup, copy, or quote without some organizations permission; and to ask for it and receive the content would be a lot of extra hassle that would end up costing a FEE. I should NEVER have to pay to see yesterday's episode of friends.

Also, there are minor infringement cases that are not worth fighting about that occur with everyone, and if enforced nobody gets anything---because its too minor for the person to pay or too minor for the owner to sue. (Such as a fan's homepage with a screenshot from a tv show...nobody puts much effort into attacking free advertising.) Also there are situations where once the copyright expires, the content is nowhere to be found---and this has already happened without all this stuff preventing people from finding it back. TIGHT CONTROL has not been possible in the past, and only by trying it for many decades will really be able to know how much damage it causes.

Change is a part of life. DTV will never reach TV's golden age. Internet has taken some of that time away. There is only so far they can go with advertising and this too limits their growth. TV KILLED THE RADIO STAR. Digital content and the internet may do the same; TV will exist but not the same as it was, and it will be so wether or not they get their fears set aside by this silly measure THE PUBLIC WILL PAY FOR.

Its the consumer's GOD GIVEN RIGHT TO CHOOSE. The CHOICE is the UNALIENABLE RIGHT that is the basis for our government. Sure some choices are illegal or were illegal, but that is an end result of having a free will. Some people make bad choices. By trying to limit choices you can not prevent the inevitable, man has always exercised his right to be stupid. And this "flag" is just another example.